



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,744	03/03/2004	Hsiang-Kai Chuang	3313-1120P	2891
2292	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			LAU, HOI CHING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2636	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/790,744

Applicant(s)

CHUANG ET AL.

Examiner

Hoi C. Lau

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/3/2004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1- 14 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens et al. (U.S. 2005/0083213).

Regarding **Claim 1**, Stevens teaches a device comprises:

an electronic tag body connecting to a reader in a wireless fashion to receive signals transmitted from the reader and store the signals (abstract and page 2, paragraphs 28-31); and  
a display module connecting to the electronic tag body to read and display the signals (figure 4 and page 2, paragraph 29 and page 4, paragraph 52).

As to **claim 2**, Stevens' device teaches an electronic tag body includes:

an antenna for receiving the signals from the reader (base station 120 and computer system 130) (figure 4 and page 2, paragraphs 26 and 31 and page 3, paragraphs 46-47)  
a radio frequency module (350) connecting to the antenna for processing the signals received by the antenna (figure 4 and page 2, paragraph 31) ;  
a baseband controller (320) connecting to the radio frequency module to control delivering and receiving of the signals (figure 4 and page 2, paragraphs 30-31);

a memory controller (320) connecting to the baseband controller (320) for receiving the signals; and

a memory (330) connecting to the memory controller (320) to store the signals.

It is inherent that the processor (320) can operate as the baseband controller, memory controller and display controller.

Regarding **claim 7**, it is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1, supra.

As to **claim 8**, it is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2, supra.

As to **claim 13**, Stevens' device teaches the reader is a portable wireless electronic device (page 3, paragraph 46).

As to **claim 14**, Stevens' device teaches the reader is connected to a stationary electronic device (page 2, paragraph 26 and page 3, paragraph 47).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens et al. (U.S. 2005/0083213) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. 4,786,902).

As to **claim 3**, Stevens' device meet all the limitation of claims and it teaches a display controller (320) connecting to the electronic tag body for receiving signals and a display panel (figure 4 and page 2, paragraph 29-31 and page 4, paragraph 52).

However, it fails to clearly state that a display interface connecting between a display controller and a display panel.

Davis' device teaches a display interface (40) connecting between a display controller and a display panel (figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement a display interface between the controller and panel because interface is the inter-connection between two electronic components.

As to **claim 4**, Stevens' device teaches the display module includes an electric power supply to provide electric power required by the display panel (figure 4 and page 2, paragraph 33).

As to **claim 5**, Stevens' device teaches the display panel is a liquid crystal display (figure 4 and page 2, paragraph 29).

As to **claim 9**, it is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3, supra.

As to **claim 10**, it is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4, supra.

As to **claim 11**, it is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5, supra.

4. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens et al. (U.S. 2005/0083213) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. 4,786,902), in further view of Giering et al. (U.S. 2005/0161501).

As to **claim 6**, the combination meets all the limitation of claims except it fails to show the display panel is an electronic paper.

Giering's device suggests the display panel is made of electronic paper or LCD (page 1, paragraph 6 and page 2, paragraph 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art both LCD and electronic paper are well-known type of display panel and either one can be choose base on environment and manufacture.

As to **claim 12**, it is rejected for similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6, supra.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Monjo (U.S. 5,963,133) teaches an electronic tag comprising a controller having a microprocessor, RAM, ROM, line drivers and receivers to interface with a main computer terminal. The electronic tag also has a plurality of switches that are connected to the controller so as to allow the input of data. Kudo (U.S. 2005/0156707) shows an integrated circuit tag includes an item information storage unit that stores item information related to the item, an item information controller that provides control to change the item information, and an item information display unit that displays the item information stored, wherein if the item information controller provides control to change the item information stored base on an

Art Unit: 2636


instruction wirelessly transmitted from a control device, then the item information display unit displays the item information changed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoi C. Lau whose telephone number is (571)272-8547. The examiner can normally be reached on M- F 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (571)272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HCL



JEFFERY HOFSSASS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600